

**REMARKS**

***Status of the Application***

Applicant thanks the Examiner for considering the references cited in the Information Disclosure Statement filed on June 13, 2007, as was evidenced by the initialed PTO form.

Claims 1, 4, 5, 8 and 17-21 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 4, 5 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Nihei (U.S. Patent No. 6,891,634). This reference was previously cited in the Office Action dated March 13, 2007. Claims 17-21 are added to describe features of the invention more particularly.

***Substantive Rejections***

The grounds of rejection maintain the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Nihei, which is previously of record. With respect to the material that was added in the most recent Amendment to claims 1 and 5, the grounds of rejection assert that Nihei discloses a selection process on output data predetermined based on the attributes of the output destination device. The grounds of rejection state that this portion of claims 1 and 5 “reads on figs. 4 and 6, which depicts that a printer can be selected based on attribute(s), capability of printing big files and the speed at which files are printed.” Figure 4 of Nihei depicts a printer verification menu which shows whether each printer has been connected to the multiple-printer control apparatus, whether it is capable of printing, and the number of sheets it is capable of printing. Figure 6 illustrates the printing times for each printer for each size of image capable of being printed. Both of these figures show printer data that is stored or displayed in the

disclosed system; neither figure discloses any type of selection process (see column 3, lines 51-67, and column 4 lines 39 to 44, for explanations of figures 4 and 6).

Further, even if Nihei discloses “that a printer can be selected based on attributes,” as the Examiner asserts, this is not what is recited in the claims. Claims 1 and 5 recite a selection process that outputs one or more of the complete image, original images, or combining data based on an output destination device. The selection process cannot be a process for selecting an output device (such as a printer), because the selection is made “based on an output destination device specified as the destination for image transmission.” Thus the grounds of rejection are in error in assessing that Nihei contains all the limitations in the claims of the current application.

#### ***Amendments to the Claims***

Applicant has amended the claims in order to improve the clarity and grammatical construction of the claims. These amendments are not limiting or narrowing amendments.

#### ***Conclusion***

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.114(c)  
U.S. Application No.: 09/987,076

Attorney Docket No.: Q66742

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.


Respectfully submitted,

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

**23373**

CUSTOMER NUMBER

  
Susan P. Pan  
Registration No. 41,239

Date: December 6, 2007